

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-24 and 26-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-24 and 26-34 are rejected. Through this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-34 have been amended and claim 35 has been added. No new matter has been added to the application. As explained in more detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request such notification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-11, 13, 22-28, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuen et al. (WO 97/34414) in view of Van der Vleuten (US 6,460,183).

Independent claim 1 includes the claimed feature of “third display generation means for generating display of a list of the selected programs stored in the storage means in a third display area of said display unit” (Emphasis Added). Applicants respectfully submit that neither Yuen nor Van der Vleuten disclose this claimed feature.

Specifically, the Office Action states that Yuen:

comprises a third display generation means for displaying a third display area for displaying a ‘last channel’ to allow a user to go back to the last channel stored in a register. Yuen also discloses that a user can select (by highlighting) one or more programs in the program guide in the ‘SURF’ mode, wherein the selection causes settings of the tuner to the selected programs. See page 5, lines 23-26. Yuen however does not disclose storing parameters identifying the one or more selected programs to a list or the step of displaying the list of selected programs.

(Office Action mailed 5/21/07, Pages 3-4). (Emphasis Added).

Applicants agree with the Office Action that Yuen does not disclose storing parameters identifying the one or more selected programs to a list or the step of displaying the list of selected programs. However, in addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuen does not also disclose, teach, or suggest displaying “a list of the selected programs . . . in a third display area of said display unit.” Moreover, Van der Vleuten does not make up for the deficiencies in Yuen.

Applicants respectfully submit that Yuen merely describes: 1) an EPG, 2) a PIP TV picture and 3) an information area for a program selected in the EPG area. However, as previously argued Yuen does not contain a description or suggestion for a third display area displaying a list of programs. Fig. 2 unit 45 of Yuen appears to only be a single line displayed in the first display area together with EPG information.

Furthermore, in order to further clarify Applicants invention, independent claim 1 has been amended to also include the claimed feature of “wherein said third display area is separate from said first display area.” Applicants submit that this feature is not disclosed by Yuen and/or Van der Vleuten. Therefore, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over Yuen and Van der Vleuten. Dependent claims 2-3 and 5-14 which ultimately depend from independent claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 1.

Similar to independent claim 1, independent claims 33 and 34 include the claimed feature of “generating display of a list of stored selected programs in a third display area of said display unit, wherein said third display area is separate from said first display area.” (Emphasis Added). Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claims 33 and 34 are allowable over Yuen and/or Van der Vleuten.

Furthermore, independent claim 22 includes the claimed feature of “generating display of said list of the selected programs stored in the storage means in a third display area of said display unit, wherein said third display area is separate from said first display area.” Applicants respectfully submit that for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 22 is allowable over Yuen and/or Van der Vleuten. Dependent claims 23-24 and 26-30 which ultimately depend from independent claim 22 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 22.

Claims 8-9, 15-18, 20 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuen et al. (WO 97/34414) in view of Van der Vleuten (US 6,460,183) and further in view of Ellis et al. (US 5,986,650).

Independent claim 31 includes the claimed feature of “generating display of a list of stored selected programs in a third display area of said display unit.” Applicants respectfully submit that neither Yuen nor Van der Vleuten disclose this claimed feature.

Specifically, the Office Action states that Yuen:

comprises a third display generation means for displaying a third display area for displaying a ‘last channel’ to allow a user to go back to the last channel stored in a register. Yuen also discloses that a user can select (by highlighting) one or more programs in the program guide in the ‘SURF’ mode, wherein the selection causes settings of the tuner to the selected programs. See page 5, lines 23-26. Yuen however does not disclose storing parameters identifying the one or more selected programs to a list or the step of displaying the list of selected programs.

(Office Action mailed 5/21/07, Pages 3-4). (Emphasis Added).

Applicants agree with the Office Action that Yuen does not disclose storing parameters identifying the one or more selected programs to a list or the step of displaying the list of selected programs. However, in addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuen does not also disclose, teach, or suggest “generating display of a list of stored selected programs in a third display areas of said display unit.” Moreover, Van der Vleuten and Ellis do not make up for the deficiencies in Yuen.

Furthermore, independent claim 31 is allowable for at least an additional reason. Independent claim 31 includes the claimed feature of “activating timer means upon additional program selection” (Emphasis Added). The Office Action states that “Yuen in view of Van der Vleuten do not expressly teach a timer means, wherein said timer means is activated upon program selection” However, the Office Action states “Ellis discloses . . . in a scanning mode, each channel of the favorite list that is tuned to, causes a timer to be activated and after a predetermined time (set by the user, see fig. 6) that has elapsed according to the timer, tunes to the next channel on the list.” Applicants respectfully submit that the timer of Ellis does not disclose this claimed feature. More specifically, Ellis merely discloses scanning channels in a

favorite list, based on a timer, which is not activated by additional program selection. Ellis describes a timer function for a scanning function and not a timer for a channel pre-selection function i.e. “activated upon program selection.” Therefore, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 31 is allowable over Yuen, Van der Vleuten, and Ellis. Dependent claim 32 which depends from independent claim 31 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 31.

Similar to independent claim 31, independent claim 15 includes the claimed feature of “third display generation means for generating display of a list of the selected programs stored in the storage means in a third display area of said display unit” (Emphasis Added). Applicants respectfully submit Yuen, Van der Vleuten, and Ellis do not disclose this claimed feature. Therefore, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is allowable over Yuen, Van der Vleuten and Ellis. Dependent claim 16-21 which depends from independent claim 15 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 15.

Furthermore, independent claim 15 is allowable for at least an additional reason. Independent claim 15 includes the claimed feature of “timer means; wherein and additional program selection causes settings and display of the additionally selected program in the second display area and wherein said timer means is activated upon additional program selection” (Emphasis Added). The Office Action states that “Yuen in view of Van der Vleuten do not expressly teach a timer means, wherein said timer means is activated upon program selection” However, the Office states “Ellis discloses . . . in a scanning mode, each channel of the favorite list that is tuned to, causes a timer to be activated and after a predetermined time (set by the user, see fig. 6) that has elapsed according to the timer, tunes to the next channel on the list.” Applicants respectfully submit that the timer of Ellis does not disclose Applicants claimed feature of “timer means; wherein and additional program selection causes settings and display of the additionally selected program in the second display area and wherein said timer means is activated upon additional program selection” (Emphasis Added) More specifically, Ellis merely discloses scanning channels in a favorite list, based on a timer, which is not activated by additional program selection. Ellis describes a timer function for a scanning function and not a timer for a channel pre-selection function i.e. “activated upon program selection.” Therefore, for

at least this additional reason Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited documents. Dependent claims 16-21 which ultimately depend on independent claim 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 15.

Furthermore, dependent claim 8 is allowable for at least an additional reason. Dependent claim 8 includes the claimed feature of “timer means, wherein said timer means is activated upon program selection . . .” (Emphasis Added). The Office Action states that “Yuen in view of Van der Vleuten do not expressly teach a timer means, wherein said timer means is activated upon program selection . . .” However, the Office states “Ellis discloses . . . in a scanning mode, each channel of the favorite list that is tuned to, causes a timer to be activated and after a predetermined time (set by the user, see fig. 6) that has elapsed according to the timer, tunes to the next channel on the list.” Applicants respectfully submit that the timer of Ellis does not disclose Applicants claimed feature of “timer means, wherein said timer means is activated upon program selection . . .” More specifically, Ellis merely discloses scanning channels in a favorite list, based on a timer, which is not activated by additional program selection. Ellis describes a timer function for a scanning function and not a timer for a channel pre-selection function i.e. “activated upon program selection.” Therefore, for at least this additional reason Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 8 is allowable over the cited documents.

Furthermore, dependent claim 29 is allowable for at least an additional reason. Dependent claim 29 includes the claimed feature of “activating timer upon program selection . . .” (Emphasis Added). The Office Action states that “Yuen in view of Van der Vleuten do not expressly teach a timer means, wherein said timer means is activated upon program selection . . .” However, the Office states “Ellis discloses . . . in a scanning mode, each channel of the favorite list that is tuned to, causes a timer to be activated and after a predetermined time (set by the user, see fig. 6) that has elapsed according to the timer, tunes to the next channel on the list.” Applicants respectfully submit that the timer of Ellis does not disclose Applicants claimed feature of “activating timer upon program selection . . .” (Emphasis Added). More specifically, Ellis merely discloses scanning channels in a favorite list, based on a timer, which is not activated by additional program selection. Ellis describes a timer function for a scanning function and not a timer for a channel pre-selection function i.e. “activated upon program

selection.” Therefore, for at least this additional reason Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 29 is allowable over the cited documents.

Therefore, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 31 is allowable over Yuen, Van der Vleuten and Ellis. Dependent claim 32 which depends from independent claim 31 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 31.

Claims 8-9, 15-18, 20 and 29-30 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they ultimately depend.

Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuen et al. (WO 97/34414) in view of Van der Vleuten (US 6,460,183) and further in view of Margulis (US 6,236,503).

Dependent claims 12 and 14 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree that either Yuen and/or Van der Vleuten, either individually or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed feature of “third display generation means for generating display of a list of the selected programs stored in the storage means in a third display area of said display unit, wherein said third display area is separate from said first display area.” Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 12 and 14 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 1 from which they ultimately depend.

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuen et al. (WO 97/34414) in view of Van der Vleuten (US 6,460,183) and Ellis et al. (US 5,986,650) and further in view of Margulis (US 6,236,503).

Dependent claims 19 and 21 ultimately depend from independent claim 15. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, Applicants respectfully disagree that Yuen, Van der Vleuten and/or Ellis, either individually or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed feature of “third display generation means for generating display of a list of the selected programs stored in the storage means in a third display area of said display unit.” Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 19 and 21 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 15 from which they ultimately depend.

Appln. No.: 09/891,379
Response/Amendment dated September 21, 2007
Response to Office Action dated May 21, 2007

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 21, 2007

By:

 51,393
Shawn P. Gorman
Reg. No. 56,197

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive - Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001